

Office of the Director
111 N. Front St., 8th Floor
Columbus, Ohio 43215-9040
(614) 645-7795
(614) 645-6675 (FAX)

Planning Division
111 N. Front St., 3rd Floor
Columbus, Ohio 43215-9040
(614) 645-8664

Downtown Commission
Daniel J. Thomas (Staff)
Urban Design Manager
(614) 645-8404
djthomas@columbus.gov

DOWNTOWN COMMISSION RESULTS

Tuesday, June 26, 2018 - 8:30 AM

111 N. Front Street, Michael B. Coleman Government Center

Hearing Room (Second Floor)

- I. Attendance** **27:50**
- Present: Steve Wittmann (Chair); Otto Beatty, Jr.; Tedd Hardesty; Kyle Katz; Robert Loversidge; Mike Lusk; Jana Maniace; Danni Palmore
- Absent: None
- City Staff: Daniel Thomas, Dan Blechschmidt; Ashley Senn
- II. Approval of the May 22, 2018 Downtown Commission Meeting Results**
- Motion to approve KK; DP -2nd (7-0)
- III. Review and Approval of Details from a Prior Case**

Case #1 18-6-1

28:30

Address: 65 S. Washington Ave.

Block bound by E. Oak, S. Washington, Library Park Dr. (North) & S. 9th

Applicant and Design Professional: Jay Boone / Moody Nolan

Property Owner: Mike Lisi / Motorist Insurance Group

Attorney Michael B. Coleman / Ice Miller

Action:

Review and approval of north elevation detail.

Discussion: MN – went through the changes – before and after. Introduction of pilasters to break up mass. Materials shown. There's more of a recess. The style of the railing has been changed – a little more detail, a second horizontal line has been added at the top. The cast stone cap remains. The articulation is about 2 inches – there is a need to correspond with the structural foundations below and respect the narrow width of the sidewalk. Some other changes have been made – the stairwell on the east does not carry through to the roof which changes the profile of the building. SW – I like the changes. KK – is there room to grow something on the wall? It's still really heavy. JM – there is now a space between the railing and the parapet. MN – we found that there was too much room on the deck, often more room than the apartments themselves. RL – so you walk out on this cool terrace and now you'll be looking at a membrane roof? KK – can the wall be greened – softened from either above or below? It could be a long termed process. SW – you don't need to do the whole thing – maybe six bays. Edge – the sidewalks are already tight areas – utilizing tree grates. RL – how much space do you need. RL – the two inch pilaster doesn't do it for me. SW – are the trees irrigated? No, we will be using a special well (cell system).

KK – I understand that value engineering has to take place these days. This is a big stretch of street. RL - Does your value engineering affect the front of the building as to what we approved? MN – no. RL – we had issues on the last big project we approved that you did.

We could vary the brick colors from bay to bay. The cast stone cap would project out as well. JM – perhaps make the parking mesh still a dark color, but slightly lighter in color than the frame. This might help articulate it too. KK – could the two inches become four inches? MN – we'll have to go back to our engineers and see how this works with the foundations. RL – this is real brick which have a dimension of four inches – a logical dimension. SW – motion? KK – I don't think we need to tie them up but we are communicating a need. We could work through staff, instead of having them come back. RL – couldn't we approve it with a four inch pilaster and swapping out the colors of brick and creating periodic pockets for ivy? KK – 2nd We can approve it that way and if you can't meet it come back.

Result: Approval a four inch pilaster and swapping out the colors of brick and creating periodic pockets for ivy. If you can't meet it come back to the Commission. (Hardesty recusing)

IV. Request for Certificate of Appropriateness

Case #2 18-6-2

Address: 230 E. Long Street

43:00

Applicant: Archall

Property Owner: Charles Street Investment Partners LLC (Denver)

Design Professional: : NBBJ (Design Architect) Archall (Architect of Record)

Request:

Certificate of Appropriateness for a 7-story (staggered floors) mixed use building – ground floor retail townhouses and parking and 6 upper floors – apartments.

This project was heard by the Commission in February 2018 on a conceptual basis.

Discussion: NBBJ – 7-story building, 205 internal parking spaces, 178,000 sf altogether, 234 residential units. Comments from conceptual review were addressed. Presenting activity at Fifth and Long. Transparent and vibrant corner. Building massing steps down and amenity space provided, including pool for residents. Also retail space. Materials and massing support the vibrancy. The interior courtyard has been opened up to the east. Articulation and massing changed on Lafayette and Neilston sides. Introduction of balconies and material changes. Sample brought. Full-width darker brick veneer on townhouses on Long as well as Fifth will be a deterrent from grime. Three varied grey colored Nichiha panels above to promote interest.

Townhomes are not immediately ADA accessible (bedrooms are on the second floor). Other residential units are ADA accessible. Some concern with planters (including the roof top) and their maintenance. A – resilient planting will be used. They would not be irrigated. Questions about dark brick and it's variation. Could have some variation although largely monolithic. JM – questions about diagonal fencing (mesh?) for parking screening. RL also voiced concerns – too much like a chain link fence. Suggestion to look at something different. RL – move approval of project as submitted conditioned that the parking mesh be looked at and submitted to staff. Advisory (non-binding) maintenance aspect of plantings both at street level and terrace level. KK – 2nd. Will return for signage.

Result: motion to approve project as submitted with the condition that the parking mesh be revised and submitted to staff. Advisory (non-binding) recommendation concerning maintenance aspect of plantings both at street level and terrace level. (8-0)

Case #3 18-16-3

57:30

Location: 150-156 N. Third St. and space between buildings**Applicant and Design Professional:** Jonathan Barnes Architecture and Design c/o Sarah Mackert**Property Owner:** Schottenstein Property Group**Request:**

Certificate of Appropriateness for Mixed Use Development – residential, retail and parking at N. Third and E. Long. Renovation of historic commercial building with new adjacent residential. Parking beneath new residential.

This project was presented on a conceptual basis to the Commission in August and November of 2017.

Discussion: Revised renderings distributed. JB – a number of changes have taken place since last time. 79 residential units, 5,848 sf of retail and 27 parking spaces. “Public space” is a component. Semipublic space over parking. Exterior circulation on elevated decks. Asking for final approval. SM – complete restoration of existing building. Replace the original cornice. Reintroduce the original store front. Will save the existing fire escape, but it will be inoperable and be painted blue to pop out. There are other means of new egress. RL – would there be a need to communicate to the tenants that the fire escape is off limits? TH – I hope code issues don’t get in the way with keeping the fire escape. Colors presented. SW – how do the steps work? A – More treads act as conventional stairs (which would be lit at night), less treads as “grandstand” (18”) . This area will be secure with a gate late night and early morning. Signage and lighting of at grade entrance discussed. Base of the new façade will be brick. Translucent polycarb above. We have also been pricing a solid version. KK – more penetration might help. JB – new building would act as a ghost of the old one. SM – we are talking about edge lighting on two sides. TH – details ofn amenity deck? SM – a lot going on – bocce ball, seating, planters, etc. Solid Juliet doors would open in. RL – haven’t seen many details on the “fully restored” older building. Would like to see more information – SM – will work with contractor to build cornice out of wood using photo documentation. RL – windows? SM – double hung and metal. RL – brick? JB – cleaning. Storefront restoration – what does that mean? SM – currently it has been reduced in size, a metal soffit has been applied to face. This will be taken off. The storefront will be opened to its original height. RL – it seems as though we should have a little more detail. SM – As far as Downtown Streetscape Standards, the distance is less than the 150 ft required for the downtown streetscape standards so we won’t be doing it. We will do landscaping and sidewalk restoration. JM – suggest that you also concentrate on lighting older building such as lighting the cornice. RL – move approval of project subject to receiving some additional information about work to be done on the historic building. Will return for signage. SW - Approval subject to you coming back to us with the details on the historic building. In the meantime you can get your certificate.

Result: Motion to approve subject to receiving more information on the historic building (cornice, storefront and windows. (8-0)

Case #4 18-6-4**Address:** 195 E. Main

1:20:00

Applicant and Design Professional : : Jonathan Barnes Architecture and Design / co: Sarah Mackert**Property Owner:** AB Partners

Request:

Certificate of Appropriateness for a 6-story mixed-use building. Demolition of existing one-story concrete block building.

A conceptual review was given in January 2018.

Discussion: Colored floor plan by staff to help explain. JB - Parking will be behind the building. Main Street will have two retail spaces and entry for the residences. There will be an elevated public space. There will be two stairwell access places. The building is off of the property line on the west by about 20 feet because of utility issues. The building forms a T shape.

Trying to address the issue of affordability. Exterior is a graphic approach. Retail is mostly transparent. SW – what is the difference between submission. SM – the latest streetscape. The windows have evolved as well. Civil has also been included. Windows will be an extruded vinyl product (used at Jeffrey Park, Casto, etc.). Samples brought. Operable components for air movement. Exterior paint colors shown.- soft light grey and charcoal. JM – have you explored any other material than EIFS? RL – what are materials on ground floor. SM – cast concrete and wood. No EIFS on lower level. SM – there might be a graphic art wall in the future. SW – explore colors. SM – different EIFS systems are being explored. There should be at least a 30 year warranty. There are issues around dryer vents, which are being avoided here. RL - There are trees on the rendering but not on the site plan – which one? SM – trees. TH – Public Service would probably bounce back to us for a deviation request. Canopies of trees have been designed to allow views of first floor retail. SM – vibrancy of outdoor café and retail as well as obscuring architectural detail. TH – we don't want to create a precedent that we are getting away from trees. Specialty pavers at the center aligning with residential lobby could be looked at. Be aware of Public Services approval process. TH – have an additional tree on each side. SW – there might be a reason to do an exception. TH – specify an Armstrong Red Maple, which is a very upright tree. ML – move to approve, OB – 2nd, I'm very glad you are moving on improving this property. RL – I want to make sure that the demolition occurs in sequence with the construction. SM – will be done with site compliance.

Result: Approval as submitted. Examine different colors and the EIFS and add some trees. Demolition occurs in sequence with the construction. (8-0)

Case #5 18-6-5**1:43:30**

Address: 266 North Fifth Street

Applicant and Architect: Ford Architects – Ainslee Stevenson

Property Owner: HCP Columbus Warehouse District LLC

Request:

Certificate of Appropriateness for renovation. CC3359.05(C)1)

Discussion: Staff – floor plans help describe the discrepancy between front and rear elevations (mezzanine in front). AS – break up the massive panes of glass with multi-panes. Openings will be maintained. Canopies and lighting will be added. Signage raceway will be removed. Masonry and stone will be maintained. On back elevation, which is at grade, the existing overhead door will be removed and replaced with glass door. New openings will also bring more light. One of the service doors will be replaced with a storefront door and awning. The use will most likely be office with the possibility of retail in the front. Signage in the front would possibly be a blade sign and will come back with that. KK – move to accept, coming back for signage. There will be a

new storefront in the existing openings. The storefront would be in black. JM – questions about rear elevation and pipes. AS – will remove as much as possible.

Result: Motion to approve, will return for signage. (8-0)

V. Request for Certificate of Appropriateness for Advertising Mural (Temporary Graphic)

Case #6 18-6-6M

1:50:00

Bobby Layman Cadillac ad mural

Address: 88 W. Mound Street

Applicant: Outfront Media / Dan Miceli

Property Owner: Kemp, Schaeffer & Rowe, Co., L.P.A.

Request:

Design review and approval for installation of a vinyl mesh advertising mural to be located on the east elevation of 88 W. Mound Street. Proposed mural — Bobby Layman Cadillac — “Dare Greatly . . .”. An ad mural (shown below) was installed last month. CC3359.07(D).

Dimensions of mural: 16’W x 20’H, two dimensional, non lit

Term of installation: Seeking approval for three months

Discussion: Staff – Case was tabled from last month. James cancer mural is still up, because of the tabling status it has remained up. Staff - applicant has followed Commission’s motion to align the James mural with the lintels. It is perhaps wider than it was supposed to be. Interaction by the owner and City Attorney’s Office about possibility of deed restriction for successive murals to return to the Commission. City Attorney advised that deed restriction not be a tactic, but that provisional status of re-review could be. New legislation would allow for administrative approval in the future. SW – Commission voted on time limit. DM – request is for the new Bobby Layman ad mural to be up for a three month period. Outfront has no problem coming back to the Commission each time. SW – in the end we need to get this resolved in one form or another. In my mind it hasn’t been resolved. I think we can move forward on a graphic. In the meantime I think we need to clarify this with the City Attorney’s Office. ML – what criteria are we using to judge this? SW – part of what has been driving this has been the Supreme Court case. RL – How does this differ from any other site that we’ve approved? Why does this one have to come back? SW – Outfront and the owner have both agreed that they could come back. I don’t think I would vote for a blanket approval. WRL – we approved this because we felt that the James campaign was worthy. Now we have a blatant, ugly advertisement. KK – this would also mean that we will be revisiting it every three months.

JM – I feel that because we really don’t have resolution, I don’t think we should have anything up there until we do know exactly what we are approving. What are our rights, when we might be approving something we don’t have the right to do so. We are prolonging something. In the beginning we were concerned with this location and we would proceed only if the City Attorney said we have the right to look at the content. We don’t have clarity and I don’t feel comfortable.

SW – someone needs to make a motion – there is a proposal. KK – we’ll honor our commitment we made previously but that time period is stopped until we get word from the City Attorney as to

what the future of this might be. SW – what is your motion? KK – to deny the application to put the new graphic up. SW – the protocol is to put this up as a positive motion for approval and then vote against it. RL – what is it that you are looking for from the City Attorney because the City Attorney has already advised that we can't ask for a deed restriction. SW – he left the opportunity for a provisional approval. I do think we are lacking some clarity. KK – I do think we articulated that our preference was not to have a mural there at all and the only reason it went up was that it was for the James. It was provisional, it was time based. Now we are right back where we started where we are saying we do not want to have an ad mural on this site.

DM – the way I understood it (and I was not here) was that we were going to get some clarity between the lawyer who owns the building and the City Attorney. We were under the assumption that we were going to get approved based on that outcome. SW – the owner did talk to the City Attorney's Office which was could this issue be solved by putting a deed restriction on it. The City Attorney advised that a deed restriction was not the way to go. I frankly don't know how or why that came out. The door wasn't closed on the idea. OB – I think we ought to be able to have some discretion when we are talking about non-profit such as James. KK – we've expressed this before. But often when we do that subsequent murals end up being commercial. ML – are we judging them on content? SW – maybe if they are provisional we can do that. OB – it is a content issue, but we are also looking at who it is. I would like to see us have discretion. DP – The James was our discretion. Otherwise, for something else, we wouldn't have approved it, and we wouldn't be having this discussion. OB – we need to get clarification as to whether we can use that as a criteria (non-profit or quasi non-profit use with a public message). SW – we need to move ahead. ML – should we table this until we get the answers? DM – we would be happy to put it up and take it down. ML – time is up for the James, I think it should come down. SW – table or vote? RL – they will have to come back either way. KK – move to table

Result: Move to table (KK) – (7-0-1) Hardesty recusing.

VI. Commission Council Variance Recommendation

Case #7 18-6-7

Address: 170 Marconi Blvd.

2:03:00

Applicant and Property Owner: Nationwide Realty Investors .

Request:

Council Variance Recommendation to allow for non-accessory (pay) parking Downtown District Zone A.

Discussion: : Jim Rost – Nationwide Realty Investors. Lot will be used primarily as an accessory for the 3,000,000 sf built in the Arena District. The definition of accessory that the City employs is not consistent with the market. All of our properties have a pay component. We would like to be able to extend that. We view this as accessory. We would like this lot to be available to the public. We see the need. The YMCA has come to us expressing an urgent need to have access to this lot. They have patrons come to work out in the morning and they have no place to park. It would be a take a ticket type lot, with an 80%(accessory) - 20% (non-accessory) split. RL – this is an exception to our normal rule. The existing garage was an eyesore and abandoned (condemned). Long term is that we are going to develop that site. Now is not the right time for that. We'll have to understand market as well as future traffic. We would like to defer the decision to develop that property. RL – this is constructed like it is more than a temporary lot. Is there any way this could have a time limit or you come back after five years. I

don't want to put a big restriction in that it will have to be developed in 2½ years, but I am cautious about setting precedence. I want to keep it flexible. There needs to be some kind of language. We have accommodated the City's storm water standards in making a better temporary lot. SW – what time frame works best for you? JR – minimum of five years. SW – we have been faced with in the past of allowing a building to come down with the understanding of and approval of development then have the property, after demolition, go fallow. SW – Understand that we are not going to ask that after five years you abandon the lot. SW - Recommend to Council that they approve the use of this for non-accessory for a period of five years and after five years this will be reviewed again. OB – so moved. TH – 2nd

Result: Recommendation to City Council that they approve the use of this for non-accessory parking for a period of five years and after five years this will be reviewed again.

VII. Business / Discussion / Report

2:11:44

Reappointment to Downtown Commission

Tedd Hardesty and Jana Maniace

Public Forum

Staff Certificates of Appropriateness have been issued since last notification (May 18, 2018)

Ad Mural – ***Bold & Italics***

1. 309 S. Fourth – Door for new retail (Dueling Axes)
2. ***15 W Cherry – iPhone ad mural***
3. 206 E. State – windows for Planned Parenthood
4. ***34 N High (N) – Sprint ad mural***
5. ***106 N. High – Red Bull ad mural***
6. 36 E Gay – Buckeye Bourbon House sidewalk café
7. 219 S. High – GOAT sidewalk café
8. 340 E Gay – Awning for Pat & Gracies
9. ***64 E Broad – Klarma ad mural***
10. ***274 S Third – Klarma ad mural***
11. ***123 E Spring – COTA ad mural***
12. 122 E. Main – Pretty in Ink sign
13. 280 N Grant – in kind (slate) roof replacement – St. Patrick
14. 136 E Broad – Sidewalk café – Athletic Club
15. 9 E Long – Emergency fire escape staircase replacement and repair
16. 8 E Long – Children's Hospital ad mural – replace one of three panels
17. 280 E Broad – Window replacement – Memorial Hall
18. 231 N Fifth – Ebb & Float signage
19. 215 E Rich – Mobil Gas Station - Wall and fence emergency repair
20. ***64 E Broad – WG University ad mural***
21. ***66 S Third – WG University ad mural***
22. ***60 E Spring – WG University ad mural***

Next regular meeting will be on July 24, 2018, the fourth Tuesday of the month (four weeks away).

If you have questions concerning this agenda, please contact Daniel Thomas, Urban Design Manager, Planning Division at 614-645-8404.

2:24:00